UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 21-CR-265(PKC)

: United States Courthouse -against-

: Brooklyn, New York

1

: Tuesday, July 11, 2023 YONG ZHU,

: 10:00 a.m.

Defendant.

- - - - X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE PAMELA K. CHEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: BREON S. PEACE, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

BY: MEREDITH ARFA IRISA CHEN

Assistants United States Attorney

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CRAIG HEEREN

NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION

950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington , DC 20530 CHRISTINE A. BONOMO, Trial Attorney BY:

For the Defendant: KEVIN KERVENG TUNG, PC

136-20 38th Avenue - Suite 13D

Flushing, New York 11354

BY: KEVIN K. TUNG, ESQ.

Court Reporter: LINDA A. MARINO, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

225 Cadman Plaza East/Brooklyn, NY 11201

lindacsr@aol.com

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript

produced by Computer-Aided Transcription.

2 Proceedings MS. CALLIE: Criminal cause for hearing, Docket 1 2 No. 21-CR-00265, USA v. Zhu. 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Will the parties please state 4 their appearances for the record, starting with the Government? 5 Good morning, your Honor. Craig Heeren 6 MR. HEEREN: 7 on behalf of the United States. With me are my colleagues 8 Meredith Arfa --9 MS. ARFA: Good morning, your Honor. MR. HEEREN: -- Irisa Chen, Trial Attorney Christine 10 Bonomo from National Security Division, and our paralegal Mary 11 12 Clare. 13 THE COURT: Good morning to all of you. 14 MR. TUNG: Kevin Tung on behalf of the Defendant, Yong Zhu, at this moment. 15 16 THE COURT: Good morning to you, Mr. Tung. 17 And to you, Mr. Zhu. 18 Let's have our interpreters state their names for the record and be sworn in. 19 20 (Interpreters sworn.) THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please state your names for 21 22 the record and indicate the language you're interpreting. 23 INTERPRETER LU: Lisa Lu, L-I-S-A L-U, Mandarin 24 interpreter. 25 Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Lu.

INTERPRETER MOY: Way Moy; W-A-Y, last name M-O-Y, in Mandarin.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Moy.

So, we're here on the ineffective assistance of counsel claim of Mr. Zhu, submitted by letter dated June 27, 2023, and it was docketed as No. 270 in the case.

The letter apparently was written in Chinese originally and then translated by someone. And, so, the translation accompanied the original Chinese letter, so I have both before me and I've reviewed the English translation of the letter.

I wanted to address you, Mr. Zhu, as well as Mr. Tung, because of the unusual posture of this claim being made.

As everyone knows, trial ended a little over a month ago, I believe, and we're in the midst of post-trial briefing on Rule 29 and 33 motions by all three defendants.

Essentially, those motions seek to vacate the verdict or overturn the verdict or, in the alternative, get a new trial for each of the defendants.

So, that makes this claim a little bit complicated procedurally to deal with. So, what I wanted to do was to be able to speak directly to Mr. Zhu, with the assistance of a translator, to explain why I am not going to address this

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

Proceedings

ineffective assistance claim now and that the better recourse, I believe, or rather better course, I should say, to pursue or to proceed on is to have Mr. Zhu, should he wish to pursue this claim, to do so post-judgment, assuming that the conviction is affirmed or not vacated and that we proceed to sentencing. And this is what's referred to as proceeding

collaterally on a claim of ineffective assistance.

Let me note that I have considered the decision in United States v. Brown by the Supreme Court, where the Supreme Court held that one way to proceed on an ineffective assistance of counsel claim made prior to sentencing is to essentially treat it as a motion for a new trial under Rule 33. And Brown is reported at -- I'm sorry, not Supreme Court, Second Circuit, I apologize, Second Circuit decision. It's reported at 623 F. 3d 104, and that's a decision from 2010.

However, there was a post-Brown decision that I think is applicable here and it is a helpful guide for me, and that's the case of *U.S. v. Fleurimont*, reported at 401 Fed. App. 580. And that's a Second Circuit decision from 2010, but it does postdate *Brown*.

And there, the Second Circuit recognized that it would not be error to deny an ineffective assistance claim made prior to sentencing where adjudicating that claim would cause unnecessary hardship, delay, and expense.

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

And that's the situation I find here. Because if I were to entertain this claim now and allow Mr. Zhu to pursue it at this moment, what I would have to do is relieve Mr. Tung, appoint new counsel for Mr. Zhu, allow there to be briefing about the ineffective assistance claim which would prevent and derail, in effect, the resolution of the Rule 29 and 33 motions, and would also delay or prevent sentence in this matter even as to the other two defendants, along with Mr. Zhu.

And the reason is because there is a common conspiracy claim as to all the defendants or two common conspiracy claims as to all defendants that are necessarily implicated by any Rule 29 and 33 briefing, and then the delay would effect, I think, the resolution of those claims as well.

Admittedly, I've considered bifurcating the defendants, separating Mr. Zhu from the other two defendants, but I think that would be highly inefficient under the circumstances.

And furthermore, it would also require me to make some kind of finding at this point that there's a basis to replace Mr. Tung as Mr. Zhu's trial counsel. And on that, I want to put on the record that I'm not able, based on the record before me at trial, to find that Mr. Tung was ineffective at least with respect to his performance at trial.

I know that Mr. Zhu's ineffective assistance claim

Proceedings

goes beyond simply what happened at trial, but I don't have the ability at this point to judge that aspect or those aspects of his ineffective assistance claim because I don't have before me a complete factual record, one that would necessarily have to be developed through a hearing, likely an evidentiary hearing, or at least submissions of affidavits.

And I do want to note on the record why I find or why I cannot find at least at this point that Mr. Tung was ineffective at the trial.

First of all, Mr. Tung did file a suppression motion seeking to preclude admission of Mr. Zhu's post-arrest statement in full. Mr. Tung did make the argument, which I think had potential merit and was not a weak argument in any way, that Mr. Zhu attempted to invoke his right to counsel before the interview started but was -- and this is the argument -- was ignored by the agents.

While I ruled against the Defendant on that argument, it was by no means without some merit based on the videotaped interview that I saw.

Secondly, at trial, even though part of the statement was admitted by my ruling and upon the motion of the Government, Mr. Tung successfully argued for the inclusion of an additional statement at that interview by Mr. Zhu that contradicted the portion that the Government relied upon or at least could be seen as contradicting the statement that the

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

Proceedings

Government relied upon. And obviously, that was a reasonable trial strategy and an appropriate one under the circumstances and helped to blunt the force or impact of the post-arrest statement or the inculpatory part of the post-arrest statement by Mr. Zhu.

Third, I noted that Mr. Tung did make reasonable arguments during summations in light of the evidence that was presented at trial and that he sought to argue against the inference that Mr. Zhu actually knew he was working for officials of the Chinese government. And I remember that Mr. Tung very vigorously argued that Mr. Zhu, along with the other defendants, were actually the victims of a plot by the Chinese government to get unwitting individuals in the United States to help them in their campaign of repatriation of purported criminals sought by the Chinese Government.

And then lastly, Mr. Tung did put on a witness, so actually put on a case, for Mr. Zhu by calling the attorney Lina Xu, and I think her last name might have been spelled X-U, to confirm or corroborate the defense's argument in theory that Mr. Zhu went to this attorney, Ms. Xu, who then made the contact with Mr. McMahon, the co-defendant --

Something wrong there, Mr. Heeren?

MR. HEEREN: Sorry, your Honor. The individual who was called, the attorney's name Shi Li Ping, S-H-I L-I P-I-N-G.

Lina Xu was the translator in the case.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. So, the attorney who Mr. Zhu saw or consulted with who then actually made the contact with Mr. McMahon, the detective or former detective hired by the other individuals that Mr. Zhu was in contact with.

So, I cannot find, as I said before, that Mr. Tung was ineffective on the record before me.

The last thing I should note is during trial, there was a sidebar after an outburst by Mr. Zhu in which he did complain about certain things that were happening during the trial. I conferred with Mr. Zhu and Mr. Tung at sidebar, and during that sidebar Mr. Zhu confirmed explicitly that he wanted Mr. Tung to continue as his lawyer during the trial and that the two had spoken and resolved whatever dispute had arisen and that had prompted Mr. Zhu's outburst.

So, based on all of those indicators, again, I cannot at this point find ineffective assistance by Mr. Tung at the trial.

That being said, and as I said before, Mr. Zhu's complaints about Mr. Tung's representation go beyond simply what happened at trial and relate to matters and issues pretrial; namely, discussions about the plea offer made by the Government in August of 2021 -- and this is based on the letter I got from Mr. Zhu -- the trial preparation itself, the

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

Proceedings

sharing of discovery with Mr. Zhu. Mr. Zhu claims that he only saw the discovery or the evidence at trial for the first time. Those are things that I cannot rule upon or take into account because I don't have an evidentiary record before me, I only have Mr. Zhu's representations at this moment.

Those could, obviously, effect the trial strategy employed or the performance Mr. Tung gave during the trial. And ultimately, it may be that post-judgment the record shows that there were some genuine inadequacies in Mr. Tung's performance at trial, but, again, I cannot make that finding at this point, which I would need to do in order to replace Mr. Tung and continue with the proceedings relating to the trial, specifically the post-trial briefing relating to the trial.

So, because of the inability to proceed without Mr. Tung's continued participation, I'm not going to rule on the ineffective assistance of counsel claim at this moment. That does not bar Mr. Zhu from raising it collaterally or post-judgment, which is typically the way these types of claims are raised.

I want to further note that part of the reason I cannot make a finding about ineffectiveness based on the record before me at trial is there is a very high standard that applies under *Strickland*. And the question is, can I find that Mr. Tung's performance and the trial strategy that

he appears to have employed was objectively unreasonable?

And I cannot make that finding based on everything I have before me at this point, including, as I said before, the decision to move to suppress Mr. Zhu's post-arrest statement and all of the other things I mentioned.

So, the way we're going to proceed is to allow Mr. Tung to continue to represent Mr. Zhu in the post-trial briefing and then we will proceed to sentencing, assuming, and only if, I don't grant any of the motions for any of the defendants and in particular Mr. Zhu.

And then, Mr. Zhu, you certainly can raise post-judgment, assuming that the verdicts stand and that you are sentenced, all of these issues, all of your complaints about what happened pretrial with respect to your representation by Mr. Zhu and during the trial, and then, of course, even post-trial in terms of the briefing if you think that that also is inadequate. You can raise all those issues then in the form of an appeal or more likely a habeas petition.

Mr. Tung, you look like you want to say something.

MR. TUNG: Yes, your Honor, can I be heard?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TUNG: Shall I stand?

THE COURT: Why don't you sit and use the

microphone?

11 Proceedings 1 And then we're going to switch interpreters, so 2 pause for a moment. 3 MR. TUNG: Sure. 4 Your Honor, first of all, when I receive a copy of this letter from Mr. Yong Zhu to the Court, I was very, very 5 surprised and I feel very disappointed. For this case, I did 6 7 a lot of work, I did --8 THE COURT: Hang on a second. 9 Mr. Moy, you have to translate -- oh, you're having trouble with the device. 10 11 INTERPRETER MOY: Yes, it's not working. 12 (Pause in proceedings.) 13 INTERPRETER MOY: My apologies to the Court. THE COURT: Mr. Moy, let us know when the device is 14 working. 15 16 INTERPRETER MOY: Mr. Zhu is requesting Mr. Tung to 17 start all over again. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Tung, before you start over again, let me just caution you. I don't want you to reveal any 19 20 attorney-client privileged communications. If you want to, 21 then we should sidebar for that purpose with Mr. Zhu or I might ask the Government -- well, actually, we'll have to 22 23 sidebar because we do have an audience. So, just be mindful 24 of that. 25 Mr. Zhu, similar for you, you have the right to

12 Proceedings maintain the confidentiality of any of your communications 1 2 with Mr. Tung at this point. So, if you want to raise 3 anything that happened or transpired between the two of you, 4 let me know, and we'll convene a sidebar, a private sidebar. 5 Go ahead, Mr. Tung. MR. TUNG: Your Honor, yes, I understood clearly. 6 7 That's why I'm not going to reveal any information that I 8 consider to be covered by attorney-client privilege. 9 THE COURT: 0kav. 10 MR. TUNG: However, the point I try to bring to the Court's attention here is because a working relationship 11 12 between me --13 THE COURT: Hang on. 14 Mr. Moy, is the translation device working? (Pause in proceedings.) 15 THE COURT: Mr. Moy, can you tell me what you're 16 17 explaining to the Defendant? 18 INTERPRETER MOY: What happened, Mr. Zhu insisted on Mr. Tung start again, so I just repeat what Mr. Tung has just 19 20 said, which was that Mr. Tung would not reveal in open court 21 anything between him and his client, that it would be 22 privileged. THE COURT: Okay. 23 24 MR. TUNG: Your Honor --25 THE COURT: Mr. Tung, stop.

Mr. Zhu, just listen to the translator, who is going to translate every word that's being said by everyone in the court in English. So, you're not going to miss anything.

Go ahead, Mr. Tung.

Just listen to the translator.

MR. TUNG: Your Honor, the reason I want to say something is because at this moment of time, it cannot possibly for me to continue to represent the Defendant.

Anything I do from now on, it will be some basis for Mr. Zhu to file complaint against me for inassistance of counsel.

THE COURT: Ineffective assistance of counsel.

MR. TUNG: I'm sorry, ineffective assistance of counsel. I'm so -- the reason I don't say it, I feel so bad about this.

So, I cannot really, honestly, to continue to effectively represent this defendant. The working relationship between us has broken. He didn't talk to me. He didn't even give me any alert before he filed this letter.

Now, your Honor, I know this is actually the strategy. He owes a lot of legal fees and he wanted to get out of to pay me legal fees.

THE COURT: Well, I can't accept any representation about what Mr. Zhu's motivations are and it's not particularly relevant to me at this point. I have to try to get the criminal proceeding completed and move forward.

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

Proceedings

Now, it sounds like you're saying you want to withdraw as his attorney. And my concern is that that will derail the post-trial briefing process because you would have to be replaced by brand new counsel -- I presume maybe court-appointed counsel based on statements about Mr. Zhu's financial wherewithal at the moment -- but that lawyer wouldn't have sat through the trial, doesn't know anything about the case, and would have to start from square one. And it would be impossible for another attorney to come in and effectively represent Mr. Zhu.

Now, I've essentially said I cannot find you were ineffective during the trial. There's no reason for me to believe you would be ineffective in briefing the trial that you prepared for and defended Mr. Zhu in. So, from my perspective, I need you to finish this process.

And, yes, Mr. Zhu is likely to raise again his ineffective assistance of counsel claim. That is his right. But it's a necessary part of this process.

The question is, why do you think you cannot be effective in briefing a Rule 29 and 33 motion?

MR. TUNG: Your Honor, obviously, there is a disagreement as to almost everything, the strategy, what you can say in the brief. So, if I do not go with his ways, it will be blamed on later for ineffective assistance of counsel. So, your Honor, I am in a no-win situation.

Proceedings

Your Honor, I will work with the newly appointed counsel by the Court. I will provide all my records, all the transcripts, everything to him, and I will be discussing with the newly appointed counsel.

But for me to continue to represent this Defendant, it is entirely inappropriate. There's no working relationship between us anymore.

Your Honor, this letter, you can ask Mr. Zhu who actually prepared for him. I guess or I suspect it is from his son. He has been interfering in the entire process during the trial. He asked me --

THE COURT: I don't really want to go down this road.

MR. TUNG: He's not a client. I just wanted to point it out to Court.

THE COURT: Let me just deal with the practicalities here because the motions are due in two weeks, on July 20.

So the proposal appears to be by Mr. Tung for him to withdraw and for CJA counsel to be appointed, with whom Mr. Tung will work to help prepare the Rule 29 and 33 motions.

But there's no question that the schedule will have to be extended and I would extend it for all.

What's the Government's view on this?

MR. HEEREN: So, as an initial matter, I believe the Court already adjourned -- I don't know if you set a new date,

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

but had adjourned Mr. Zhu's response time in light of these issues. So, I think we're already at a position where we may be moving things a little bit anyway.

The Government has no objection to a reasonable extension of time, but we agree with the Court that sort of the process that I think is starting to be envisioned here would unduly delay, would create a much more extensive delay than I think what the Court and what the Government would contemplate.

It's one thing to extend it a few more weeks given this sort of issue to be hashed out so counsel can focus back on the issues at trial, it's another thing entirely to derail the whole process while we figure out new counsel.

I would point the Court in the same vein of ineffective assistance claims to a case *United States v. Ashburn*, A-S-H-B-U-R-N, 2015 Westlaw 2179794. In that case, Judge Garaufis similarly ruled that an ineffective assistance claim should wait until collateral -- post-judgment proceedings and similarly denied a motion for withdrawal by CJA counsel, predicated largely on the same arguments the Court just made.

THE COURT: While post-trial motions were pending.

MR. HEEREN: Correct, prejudgment, post-trial.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. HEEREN: I don't need to rehash what the Court

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

Proceedings

said. I think what the Court said is right. There is no reason to believe Mr. Tung will be ineffective based on the record that was developed at Court. Obviously, Mr. Zhu retains the right to say what he may say on appeal, but that alone is not an appropriate basis for withdrawal or for the motion to be filed now.

And similar to what Judge Garaufis did, I think it would be appropriate to find that relieving counsel, similar to proceeding on the ineffective assistance claim, would pose unnecessary hardship to both defendant and co-defendants, delay, and expense.

THE COURT: I think that is correct and I agree with Judge Garaufis' approach because, as I said before, I don't have any reason to believe, Mr. Tung, that you will not be able to effectively put together the Rule 29 and 33 motion.

The issues are quite explicitly drawn. The test is whether or not the evidence was sufficient to prove all the elements of the crime, the crimes of which he was convicted. You know better than anyone how to make that motion, having obviously defended Mr. Zhu through the case and knowing the evidence as you do.

So, it would be extraordinarily disruptive to this process and highly inefficient for me to substitute another attorney. Even if you help them, there's virtually no way for that person to do a better job or to do it in a timely

fashion. And I would be putting someone else, another attorney, I think in a very difficult and compromising position by substituting them in the midst of post-trial briefing.

There's no way to prevent Mr. Zhu from eventually alleging ineffective assistance. But if you properly do the briefing, as I think you can do, the argument will fail.

The question really for me in terms of his ineffective assistance claim is going to be or I think the focus will likely be on what happened before the trial started. And that history is already written and there's no one doing it.

So, at this point, I'm not going to let you withdraw because of the effect it would have on this case and proceeding to reaching finality.

MR. TUNG: Your Honor, there is a great possibility that motion will be denied. So, there will be another for Mr. Zhu to blame me for; that I didn't do a good job, I should have done a much better job.

THE COURT: Mr. Tung, I can't protect lawyers from claims by their disgruntled clients or their unhappy clients that they didn't do a good job. If you do your job as you think is appropriate, then all will be well. But if I entertained every concern a lawyer had about being accused of not doing a good enough job, that would cause our system to

grind to a halt.

Now, let me just say this: My only concern is that you're expressing, your telling me, that your relationship with Mr. Zhu has irrevocably broken down. That, I think, is certainly buttressed by Mr. Zhu's filing of this letter. But I don't actually think for purposes of filing this motion that that level of communication is as essential as it is, for example, in deciding how to proceed, whether to go to trial or to plead guilty, or how to proceed in trial.

Again, this is a very discreet task which has to do with reviewing the trial record and making appropriate arguments about the sufficiency or lack of sufficiency or inadequacy of the evidence put forth, something that lawyers are equipped to do and doesn't require the same kind of or the same level of input from a client.

MR. TUNG: Your Honor, I agree with you.

I would like your Honor to tell Mr. Zhu that I will prepare this motion based on the records, based on the evidence presented during the trial, and I do not want to specifically speaking with his family members. They have no business in pushing me to one way or the other to prepare this motion.

Or your Honor, if this is not true, I cannot be listening to other people, even family members, to push me. If they do, your Honor, I cannot focus on preparing this

motion effectively. Because they do not know the laws.

THE COURT: Mr. Tung, I have a simple prescriptive: Just ignore them.

And I can't get in the middle of your relationship between you or Mr. Zhu or the family members, but, obviously, you've made it clear on the record you are not going to take advice, counsel, or interference, accept any interference from Mr. Zhu's family members. That's fine.

Just dispatch your duty as you're supposed to, complete the motion, and we'll proceed accordingly after that.

MR. TUNG: Your Honor, then another question is let's say the motion is denied partially or maybe fully denied and then we'll have to move on to stage of sentencing.

At that point in time, your Honor, can you replace me with a new attorney to argue sentencing?

I just cannot do this anymore, your Honor. I'm also a person. Yes, I'm attorney. I'm also a person, a person, a live person.

THE COURT: All right, well, that is potentially one course of action. Sentencing is in many ways a distinct endeavor and I think a new attorney could step in and effectively represent Mr. Zhu for sentencing purposes. And, obviously, they'll have available to them the entire trial and post-trial record.

I don't know if the Government has a view on that.

It's unusual but not unheard of for there to be change of counsel before sentencing. And it is certainly one way, at least, to minimize the extent of any post-judgment proceedings regarding ineffective assistance of Mr. Tung.

Mr. Heeren, I don't know if you want to be heard at all on that issue at this point.

MR. HEEREN: I think, your Honor, I think any decision on that is best left until after the Court -- if we're going to get to sentencing, after the Court rules on Rule 29. Rule 33.

I would just note that if -- I agree with the Court's sense that it's distinct, but it will cause some delay still, some significant delay. But I think it's best left to consider that after the Rule 29, Rule 33 motions.

MR. TUNG: Lastly, your Honor --

THE COURT: So it's clear, Mr. Tung, I'm not going to make a decision about that yet. And I do agree with the Government at least that it's wiser to wait to see what happens first and see if I have to deal with that issue. In any event, I can't rule on that at the moment.

Go ahead.

MR. TUNG: Lastly, your Honor, because after we receive your order, our office is suspended time and it spent time working on that motion for that period of time. So, your Honor, two weeks -- additional two weeks from the original

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

22 Proceedings deadline, let us to make it up; otherwise, it will be 1 2 something not very well written, prepared, so that it will 3 subject us to another claim for ineffective assistance of 4 counsel. 5 THE COURT: I think, and I have to go back and look at the docket, but I may have already granted more time for 6 7 Mr. Zhu's motion because of what's been happening. 8 Can someone check the docket? Did we extend it for 9 everyone? 10 Right now, we did stay the filing of the motion 11 pending the resolution of this representation issue. 12 So, you want two weeks beyond July 20; is that 13 right, Mr. Tung? 14 MR. TUNG: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: That seems certainly appropriate under 16 the circumstances. 17 MR. HEEREN: Your Honor, we have no objection to 18 that. 19 One thing we would propose considering is whether we 20 extend everybody's so that we're on the same timetable. 21 only hesitation is, obviously, other defense counsel isn't 22 here so I don't know what their position would be. 23 imagine they'd have any issue with it and I suppose the Court 24 can just do it.

THE COURT: Or they can submit their motions early,

23 Proceedings but I'm not sure anyone will do that. 1 2 So, yes, I'm going to extend the time for all 3 Defendants. Obviously, if someone has a complaint from the 4 other defense camps, they can let me know. They won't be shy, I'm sure. But I, too, don't see they'll complain about having 5 two more weeks other than the fact it delays the ultimate 6 7 conclusion, but, obviously, more time to try to argue against 8 the verdicts is going to be viewed as positive, I'm sure. 9 The new deadline for everyone's motions is? 10 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: August 3. THE COURT: August 3. 11 12 And then how much time had I given the Government 13 originally? 14 MR. HEEREN: You had given the Government 60 days, your Honor. 15 16 THE COURT: Do you still need 60, you think? 17 That's long. 18 MR. HEEREN: I think so, your Honor, just because it was a pretty voluminous trial record. 19 20 THE COURT: Sixty days, Fida. 21 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: September 28. 22 THE COURT: And then I think I've given the defense 23 three weeks for replies; is that right? THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Is it two weeks or three 24 25 weeks?

THE COURT: I think for some reason I had given one extra week, but I don't remember.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: October 16.

THE COURT: Now Mr. Zhu, I don't want to keep you from saying anything if you want to, but I really caution you against getting into the specifics of your claim at this point. I want to assure you that you will have an opportunity after we complete the trial-related process and after sentencing, if any, to raise your claims again.

Do you understand what I've said so far?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't quite understand.

THE COURT: What I want you to understand is that you've raised your claim regarding your dissatisfaction with Mr. Tung's representation of you while we're still in the middle of finalizing the process we've started. So, there are motions that are pending that Mr. Tung is in the best position to represent you on at this moment.

If I were to replace Mr. Tung, the proceedings would be delayed for months. And that wouldn't, I don't think, best serve your interest because I still couldn't address some of the claims you make about the ineffectiveness, some of which relate to what happened before trial. Or if I did, it would just take a long time and you would be in this Limbo for a very long time, with the possible result that you would get a new trial at best and you would then end up having to do

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

another trial potentially or restart your criminal process.

For your sake as well as the other two defendants, whose interests I have to consider, it makes more sense to finish the process we've started, see if there's any merit to the motions to vacate the convictions of you and the other defendants and, if not, proceed to sentencing, at which point you can then raise all of the ineffective assistance claims you're raising with me now and they can be fully explored.

That's how many Courts have proceeded in a situation such as this. It's not typical for a defendant to raise an ineffective assistance claim as soon as the verdict comes down. Most defendants wait until the process is fully completed and, in part, so they can raise all of their complaints at the same time about the lawyer's performance.

I'm not saying what you did was inappropriate in any way. And it does happen. But judges have some discretion on how to deal with it in light of the bigger picture, in light of the interest in this case of two other defendants whose convictions are still pending also and who aren't making the same claims as you.

If I let you proceed with your ineffective assistance claim, it would almost certainly delay the resolution of their criminal cases. And they have a very strong interest in trying to get to the conclusion of their cases alongside yours because many of the claims are common or

many of the crimes alleged are common to all of you.

So, the takeaway for you should be that you're not being deprived of your right or denied the right to make your ineffective assistance claims, I'm just finding that now is not the time for me to address them. And for your sake as well as the interests of the other defendants, I'm choosing to proceed to finish the criminal process that started with the trial, in effect, and resulted in convictions and which I need to complete before addressing your broader claims of ineffective assistance.

Partly I say that because you are alleging that Mr. Tung didn't adequately advise you about the plea offer in this case. That certainly could have the effect of undoing the conviction, assuming that it still stands. But it's an issue that really goes back in time and requires fact finding which will take time. And I want to give it a serious look and serious consideration.

So, I don't want there to be this time pressure which exists right now because we're in the middle of finishing the process we started once the trial began. But I can assure you that I will give full consideration to any claim you make, just not now.

Do you understand what I'm saying?

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: Now, my having said that, is there

27 Proceedings anything you want to say? 1 2 And, again, I caution you against getting into the 3 merits of any of your complaint right now. 4 THE DEFENDANT: It's matter that the whole case my attorney has not expressed clearly --5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Mr. Moy --6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Moy, you have to use the microphone. 8 Start again, Mr. Moy. 9 Hold on, Mr. Tung. 10 THE DEFENDANT: It's that my attorney has not expressed fully, completely about my case. 11 12 I understand that you feel that from the THE COURT: 13 beginning Mr. Tung didn't sufficiently advise you about the 14 nature of your case, the potential consequences, the evidence or discovery that the Government had provided relating to the 15 16 I understand that that's your claim. 17 Mr. Tung, you don't need to defend against it now. 18 So, I understand, Mr. Zhu, you're going back even 19 before the trial. And that claim can be fully explored and 20 can be the subject of a hearing, but just not now. 21 Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: But I did not have the opportunity 22 23 to express... 24 THE COURT: You will, just not now. 25 MR. TUNG: Your Honor --

Proceedings 28 Hold on. He's still translating. 1 THE COURT: 2 Mr. Zhu, understand that I'm just not letting you 3 express or explain or go into any more detail now. 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm innocent. It's that all these people who, you know, cut parts of the videotape and put 5 it together and put this piece here, this piece there, and to 6 7 present it as evidence. 8 THE COURT: But that's the subject of the motions 9 that are being briefed right now. You just need to let 10 Mr. Tung finish the process. I understand that you're dissatisfied with him right 11 12 now, but because replacing him at this point will only delay 13 the conclusion of this trial and you could well end up still 14 being convicted but four months from now, rather than getting to some answer to that question soon --15 16 MR. TUNG: Your Honor --17 THE COURT: Mr. Tung, you have to let him finish 18 translating. 19 Are you done, Mr. Moy? 20 INTERPRETER MOY: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Go ahead. 22 MR. TUNG: Your Honor, I think at this moment in

MR. TUNG: Your Honor, I think at this moment in time, even though I'm not going to be relieved, I think, your Honor, I beg you to appoint a public defender to work with me so Mr. Zhu can express his concerns through that attorney and

23

24

let that attorney to have a second opinion to work with me on how to prepare the motion. Otherwise, your Honor, this is not going to work.

He already said he distrusts me. There's no way -there's nothing I can do to relieve his feeling to make him
feel comfortable to work with me. So your Honor, it's
really -- I mean, I'm not delaying the process, all I'm asking
you appoint a second counsel so Mr. Zhu can communicate with
him and then -- and both of us can discuss.

So, otherwise, whatever I said will not be good for him. This is not going to work, your Honor. I'm not going to be relieved, I know that. So, I will be working on motion to finish it, but let him to have a second opinion. But he couldn't afford a private counselor, and he indicated, which might be true because he owe me over \$10,000 legal fees at this point in time.

So, your Honor, I think you appoint a second counsel so he might have a second opinion. I'm not holding other counsel liable for the motion, but all I'm saying with both counsel, maybe I can handle this difficult client.

THE COURT: Let's take a ten-minute break. I want to consider this proposal.

And I'll hear from the Government when we get back. Let's break until 11:15.

(Recess taken.)

THE COURT: Have a seat, everyone.

I've given this some thought, the current proposal having a CJA attorney or Federal Defender, if they're not conflicted, appointed to assist with the motion briefing.

Let me just say by way of preamble, perhaps,

Mr. Tung, since I'm not letting you withdraw, you are still

Mr. Zhu's attorney and you have an ethical obligation to

communicate with him as best as possible. You can't simply

give up or throw up your hands and say, "I'm not going to try

because he's difficult." So, I just want to make that clear.

Mr. Zhu, by the same token, you have to communicate with your lawyer or else you cannot complain later that they did not do what you wanted them to do. You can't simply say, "I don't like my lawyer, I don't agree with his advice; therefore, I'm not going to speak to him." That's not going to allow you later to complain that somehow he was ineffective because he didn't do what you wanted him to do or was objectively unreasonable in how he proceeded.

That being said, I do want to enable Mr. Zhu and you, Mr. Tung, to be able to put forth the best motion that you can. If it would facilitate that, I will appoint CJA or Federal Defender counsel.

Are the Federal Defenders conflicted in this case?

Because I think all three defendants came in with paid representation, right?

Proceedings 31 1 MR. HEEREN: They did. 2 One of the defendants who pled guilty had a Federal 3 Defender in California, not here. I just don't recall if any 4 of the Federal Defenders here had any contact on this case, so I can't say for certain. 5 THE COURT: And I wonder what their conflict rule 6 7 is. 8 MR. HEEREN: I don't know. 9 THE COURT: Perhaps the safer course is simply then 10 to appoint a CJA attorney. 11 Now, we have determined that today's duty CJA 12 counsel is conflicted and tomorrow's is as well, I think. 13 Fida, is that right? 14 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Eric Franz? 15 MR. HEEREN: No. 16 THE COURT: Eric Franz, we'll notify him that he needs to assist Mr. Tung. 17 18 You know what? Let me not actually make that 19 decision yet. Let me think about who might be best suited to 20 assist with this particular situation and task, which is 21 obviously focused on a written submission and reviewing the 22 trial record. Some lawyers I think are more suited to that 23 than others or might have the time right now to do that. 24 So, let me explore who might be appropriate CJA 25 counsel. We'll appoint them by tomorrow once we search.

MR. TUNG: Yes, your Honor.

I will still be the main writer to finish the draft. So, during that process -- it will take another two weeks at least. So, during that process, whoever the new attorney is appointed -- not new attorney, the second attorney appointed will have a chance to catch up.

THE COURT: Bear in mind, Mr. Tung, one problem with this notion you have that that second attorney might be a go-between for you and Mr. Zhu is that I don't think or I don't know of any CJA attorneys who are fluent in Mandarin. So, that may present some issue.

Like I said, you still have an ethical duty to communicate with your client and make the effort to communicate.

And again, I'm going to remind you, Mr. Zhu, that if you want to have the motion be as good as possible, you need to communicate with Mr. Tung and the second attorney that I will assign to assist with putting together the motion. I don't think I'll find someone who speaks Mandarin, so Mr. Tung may still have to be your main point of contact.

MR. TUNG: Yes, your Honor, I will continue to -- I will prepare the motion to draft and I will call Mr. Zhu into my office and explain it to him, what my strategy is, why I'm picking up those facts; if he has anything to add or if he has any other ideas, he can talk to me.

Proceedings

But one thing that I will not talk to his family members because they are disturbance. They're only creating more problems for me to continue to work on this case effectively.

THE COURT: Obviously, that's something you and Mr. Zhu should work out. And as I said before, you can simply ignore those other family members.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, with your permission.

I haven't seen Mr. Tung ever since the end of the case. I have never had telephone calls with him after the verdict.

MR. TUNG: You had a telephone conversation with my law clerk Mr. Tung, correct?

THE COURT: Mr. Tung, I don't want you directing any questions to Mr. Zhu.

The bottom line is there is a task at hand. It needs to be completed within the next four weeks. Mr. Tung will communicate with you as necessary to write the brief -- the motion, rather, that he needs to write.

But you should call his office, insist that he speak to you to the extent you need to talk about something. But remember that the immediate responsibility he has and that you should talk to him about is filing this motion which asks for the guilty verdict to be overturned based on the insufficiency of the evidence. And that's the argument, obviously.

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

So, that's all you need to focus on right now with respect to you and Mr. Tung.

Mr. Tung, obviously, I think you ought to talk to Mr. Zhu sooner rather than later just to try to clear the air and confirm that the two of you need to work together, or at least you need to consult with him to the extent necessary on this motion.

MR. TUNG: And he's free to take my prepared draft to go to the Government-appointed attorney for advice and for consultation. I have no objection at this point in time. I will take whoever's advice is free. I cannot really...

THE COURT: Mr. Tung, I don't want you to communicate to your client through this process. You need to communicate with him directly. But I accept your representation that you'll work with the second counsel and take whatever advice or consultation that person has to give about how to prepare the motion once that second lawyer has had a chance to review the record.

MR. TUNG: Thank you, your Honor. I really appreciate it.

THE COURT: So, that concludes the proceeding unless the Government wants to say anything else.

MR. HEEREN: Very briefly, your Honor. I'm sorry.

This is a sort of unusual situation, obviously. One sort of procedural wrinkle is that Mr. Tung is obviously

Linda A. Marino, Official Court Reporter

	W. Name - direct/cross - Atty 35
1	retained. I think the best way to craft this, I would
2	propose, is at trial and today there's been some indication
3	that Mr. Zhu can no longer afford to pay Mr. Tung. And he
4	already submitted a financial affidavit on that score that I
5	think the Court can rely on. So, I think the way that might
6	make most sense is to convert Mr. Tung to CJA counsel and then
7	the second counsel can be appointed and that should streamline
8	everything.
9	THE COURT: That's good. The problem is it's not
10	proper because Mr. Tung is not part of the CJA panel. So, he
11	will remain in his status, but I can certainly find that
12	Mr. Tung qualifies for CJA counsel and appoints someone based
13	on the financial affidavit.
14	So, I do appreciate you mentioning what is
15	essentially an administrative housekeeping matter.
16	Mr. Tung, you remain retained counsel because I
17	can't appoint you because you're not on our CJA panel.
18	MR. TUNG: Understood.
19	THE COURT: Whatever your payment arrangement with
20	Mr. Zhu is up to you two to resolve, but I will appoint CJA
21	counsel to assist.
22	MR. TUNG: Thank you, your Honor.
23	MR. HEEREN: Nothing else.
24	THE COURT: Thank you very much, everyone.
25	(Matter concluded.)